

TELEGRAPHIC NEWS.

NIGHT DISPATCHES.

CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS.

RECONSTRUCTION BILL IN THE SENATE.

ITS UNCONSTITUTIONALITY EXPOSED.

REMARKS OF SENATOR BUCKALEW.

11TH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 29.

SENATE.

A COMMUNIQUE from the President, enclosing the report of the Secretary of State relative to the purchase of Alaska, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Resolutions from the Colorado Legislature, praying admissions to the Union, were referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. Trumbull from the Judiciary Committee, reported adversely on a bill to abolish the District Court for the Eastern District of Texas.

Mr. Mullikin introduced a bill granting public lands for the construction of a railroad from Brownsville, Nebraska to the intersection of the Union Pacific rail road. Referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. Anthony introduced a joint resolution for the publication of a medical and surgical history of the rebellion, with statistics of the present marshals' bureau.

Mr. Pomeroy introduced a bill authorizing the sale of public lands in Alabama. Referred to Land Committee.

On motion of Mr. Grimes, the Senate took up the bill for the sale of iron clad ships, and the bill was passed.

Mr. Anthony introduced a bill providing for the retention of those in the Dictator, Kalamazoo, and Passaic classes, 19 in all, leaving 29 to be released.

Mr. Anthony introduced a bill creating a national bureau of insurance.

At the expiration of the moratorium the supplementary reconstruction bill came up.

Mr. Pomeroy argued at length to Mr. Buckalew that the latest amendment had defended the constitutional amendment, claiming that the majority of the law should be vindicated by the disfranchisement of negroes.

Mr. Buckalew, in his speech, said a cheerful respite of the reconstruction act.

At the conclusion of the Senator's remarks Mr. Crisp obtained the floor and the Senate adjourned.

Congress the clear duty of reconstructing the government that it is now in form. It did not do so, but it did not do so, and the financial laws of the Constitution, which was adopted by this Legislation.

Instead of guaranteeing a republican form of government, the reconstruction laws of 1865 were a military dictatorship, and sought to overthrow them. It was an insult to common sense to call them republican forms of government.

They were really military dictators, bringing the whole country down to a point that long ago had fallen. Could republican forms of government be maintained by the rule of the bayonet over all the rights of person and property, and the right of a man to be ruled by his father? Suppose a war of races should arise, they most rule men and money to meet that state of things until even a more despotic system was established. They did not do one could doubt that their motives were to retain their present unjust share of power in the nation.

More Clarendon opposed the bill. He argued that the proposed bill would give to slaves the right to be taxed by their masters. Suppose a war of races should arise, they most rule men and money to meet that state of things until even a more despotic system was established. They did not do one could doubt that their motives were to retain their present unjust share of power in the nation.

The legislation was intended as a gesture to themselves and against the people that they could retain power, despite the Constitution, which they trampled under foot.

He denied that the President had any right to interfere with the circumstances, more business than Congress to set up a State government. At the close of the war he had certainly exercised that power in establishing provisional governments, but could not do so again.

Mr. Mullikin, speaking for the Government, supported his bill. He argued that the arguments against the bill were based upon the neighboring European powers, all of whom should unite to resist the Empire of Russia, and the Republic of America.

The bill was referred to the committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Mullikin, speaking for the Government, supported his bill. He argued that the arguments against the bill were based upon the neighboring European powers, all of whom should unite to resist the Empire of Russia, and the Republic of America.

The bill was referred to the committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Mullikin, speaking for the Government, supported his bill. He argued that the arguments against the bill were based upon the neighboring European powers, all of whom should unite to resist the Empire of Russia, and the Republic of America.

The bill was referred to the committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Mullikin, speaking for the Government, supported his bill. He argued that the arguments against the bill were based upon the neighboring European powers, all of whom should unite to resist the Empire of Russia, and the Republic of America.

The bill was referred to the committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Mullikin, speaking for the Government, supported his bill. He argued that the arguments against the bill were based upon the neighboring European powers, all of whom should unite to resist the Empire of Russia, and the Republic of America.

The bill was referred to the committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Mullikin, speaking for the Government, supported his bill. He argued that the arguments against the bill were based upon the neighboring European powers, all of whom should unite to resist the Empire of Russia, and the Republic of America.

The bill was referred to the committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Mullikin, speaking for the Government, supported his bill. He argued that the arguments against the bill were based upon the neighboring European powers, all of whom should unite to resist the Empire of Russia, and the Republic of America.

The bill was referred to the committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Mullikin, speaking for the Government, supported his bill. He argued that the arguments against the bill were based upon the neighboring European powers, all of whom should unite to resist the Empire of Russia, and the Republic of America.

The bill was referred to the committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Mullikin, speaking for the Government, supported his bill. He argued that the arguments against the bill were based upon the neighboring European powers, all of whom should unite to resist the Empire of Russia, and the Republic of America.

The bill was referred to the committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Mullikin, speaking for the Government, supported his bill. He argued that the arguments against the bill were based upon the neighboring European powers, all of whom should unite to resist the Empire of Russia, and the Republic of America.

The bill was referred to the committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Mullikin, speaking for the Government, supported his bill. He argued that the arguments against the bill were based upon the neighboring European powers, all of whom should unite to resist the Empire of Russia, and the Republic of America.

The bill was referred to the committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Mullikin, speaking for the Government, supported his bill. He argued that the arguments against the bill were based upon the neighboring European powers, all of whom should unite to resist the Empire of Russia, and the Republic of America.

The bill was referred to the committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Mullikin, speaking for the Government, supported his bill. He argued that the arguments against the bill were based upon the neighboring European powers, all of whom should unite to resist the Empire of Russia, and the Republic of America.

The bill was referred to the committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Mullikin, speaking for the Government, supported his bill. He argued that the arguments against the bill were based upon the neighboring European powers, all of whom should unite to resist the Empire of Russia, and the Republic of America.

The bill was referred to the committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Mullikin, speaking for the Government, supported his bill. He argued that the arguments against the bill were based upon the neighboring European powers, all of whom should unite to resist the Empire of Russia, and the Republic of America.

The bill was referred to the committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Mullikin, speaking for the Government, supported his bill. He argued that the arguments against the bill were based upon the neighboring European powers, all of whom should unite to resist the Empire of Russia, and the Republic of America.

The bill was referred to the committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Mullikin, speaking for the Government, supported his bill. He argued that the arguments against the bill were based upon the neighboring European powers, all of whom should unite to resist the Empire of Russia, and the Republic of America.

The bill was referred to the committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Mullikin, speaking for the Government, supported his bill. He argued that the arguments against the bill were based upon the neighboring European powers, all of whom should unite to resist the Empire of Russia, and the Republic of America.

The bill was referred to the committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Mullikin, speaking for the Government, supported his bill. He argued that the arguments against the bill were based upon the neighboring European powers, all of whom should unite to resist the Empire of Russia, and the Republic of America.

The bill was referred to the committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Mullikin, speaking for the Government, supported his bill. He argued that the arguments against the bill were based upon the neighboring European powers, all of whom should unite to resist the Empire of Russia, and the Republic of America.

The bill was referred to the committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Mullikin, speaking for the Government, supported his bill. He argued that the arguments against the bill were based upon the neighboring European powers, all of whom should unite to resist the Empire of Russia, and the Republic of America.

The bill was referred to the committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Mullikin, speaking for the Government, supported his bill. He argued that the arguments against the bill were based upon the neighboring European powers, all of whom should unite to resist the Empire of Russia, and the Republic of America.

The bill was referred to the committee of the House of Representatives.

EUROPE.

ATLANTIC CABLE TELEGRAMS.

ORGANIZATION OF THE FRENCH ARMY.

Critical Condition of Italian Affairs.

Relations Between France and Italy Not Cordial.

Excitement in the Richmond Convention.

Paris, Jan. 29.

The bill for the reorganization of the army, having passed the Corps Legislatif, came before the Senate this week, and gave rise to an interesting discussion.

Mons. Clermont opposed the bill. He argued that the proposed organization would be maintained by the rule of the bayonet over all the rights of person and property, and the right of a man to be ruled by his father?

He denied that the President had any right to interfere with the internal affairs of France.

He argued that the proposed organization would be maintained by the rule of the bayonet over all the rights of person and property, and the right of a man to be ruled by his father?

He denied that the President had any right to interfere with the internal affairs of France.

He argued that the proposed organization would be maintained by the rule of the bayonet over all the rights of person and property, and the right of a man to be ruled by his father?

He denied that the President had any right to interfere with the internal affairs of France.

He argued that the proposed organization would be maintained by the rule of the bayonet over all the rights of person and property, and the right of a man to be ruled by his father?

He denied that the President had any right to interfere with the internal affairs of France.

He argued that the proposed organization would be maintained by the rule of the bayonet over all the rights of person and property, and the right of a man to be ruled by his father?

He denied that the President had any right to interfere with the internal affairs of France.

He argued that the proposed organization would be maintained by the rule of the bayonet over all the rights of person and property, and the right of a man to be ruled by his father?

He denied that the President had any right to interfere with the internal affairs of France.

He argued that the proposed organization would be maintained by the rule of the bayonet over all the rights of person and property, and the right of a man to be ruled by his father?

He denied that the President had any right to interfere with the internal affairs of France.

He argued that the proposed organization would be maintained by the rule of the bayonet over all the rights of person and property, and the right of a man to be ruled by his father?

He denied that the President had any right to interfere with the internal affairs of France.

He argued that the proposed organization would be maintained by the rule of the bayonet over all the rights of person and property, and the right of a man to be ruled by his father?

He denied that the President had any right to interfere with the internal affairs of France.

He argued that the proposed organization would be maintained by the rule of the bayonet over all the rights of person and property, and the right of a man to be ruled by his father?

He denied that the President had any right to interfere with the internal affairs of France.

He argued that the proposed organization would be maintained by the rule of the bayonet over all the rights of person and property, and the right of a man to be ruled by his father?

He denied that the President had any right to interfere with the internal affairs of France.

He argued that the proposed organization would be maintained by the rule of the bayonet over all the rights of person and property, and the right of a man to be ruled by his father?

He denied that the President had any right to interfere with the internal affairs of France.

He argued that the proposed organization would be maintained by the rule of the bayonet over all the rights of person and property, and the right of a man to be ruled by his father?

He denied that the President had any right to interfere with the internal affairs of France.

He argued that the proposed organization would be maintained by the rule of the bayonet over all the rights of person and property, and the right of a man to be ruled by his father?

He denied that the President had any right to interfere with the internal affairs of France.

He argued that the proposed organization would be maintained by the rule of the bayonet over all the rights of person and property, and the right of a man to be ruled by his father?

He denied that the President had any right to interfere with the internal affairs of France.

He argued that the proposed organization would be maintained by the rule of the bayonet over all the rights of person and property, and the right of a man to be ruled by his father?

He denied that the President had any right to interfere with the internal affairs of France.

He argued that the proposed organization would be maintained by the rule of the bayonet over all the rights of person and property, and the right of a man to be ruled by his father?

He denied that the President had any right to interfere with the internal affairs of France.

He argued that the proposed organization would be maintained by the rule of the bayonet over all the rights of person and property, and the right of a man to be ruled by his father?

He denied that the President had any right to interfere with the internal affairs of France.

He argued that the proposed organization would be maintained by the rule of the bayonet over all the rights of person and property, and the right of a man to be ruled by his father?

He denied that the President had any right to interfere with the internal affairs of France.

He argued that the proposed organization would be maintained by the rule of the bayonet over all the rights of person and property, and the right of a man to be ruled by his father?

He denied that the President had any right to interfere with the internal affairs of France.

He argued that the proposed organization would be maintained by the rule of the bayonet over all the rights of person and property, and the right of a man to be ruled by his father?

He denied that the President had any right to interfere with the internal affairs of France.

He argued that the proposed organization would be maintained by the rule of the bayonet over all the rights of person and property, and the right of a man to be ruled by his father?

He denied that the President had any right to interfere with the internal affairs of France.

He argued that the proposed organization would be maintained by the rule of the bayonet over all the rights of person and property, and the right of a man to be ruled by his father?

He denied that the President had any right to interfere with the internal affairs of France.

He argued that the proposed organization would be maintained by the rule of the bayonet over all the rights of person and property, and the right of a man to be ruled by his father?

</

